

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 7 and 10 have been amended to clarify the manner in which the inventions recited distinguish patentably from the combination of references relied upon in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 7 now recites a plurality of discrete magnetic components, each formed as a toric section bundle of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons which is generally circular sector-shaped in plan view.

Claim 10 now recites a magnetic component comprising a member constructed of a bundle of wires or magnetic ribbons arranged as a generally toric-section having a circular sector-shape in plan view defined by an inner peripheral portion and an outer peripheral portion and opposite sides that diverge from respective spaced ends of the inner peripheral portion to respective spaced ends of the outer peripheral portion.

The magnetic cores 1 of Nakao et al are generally circular sector-shaped in plan view, but they are not formed of bundles of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons. They are solid ferrite magnetic bodies produced by pressure forming and burning. See the paragraph bridging columns 5-6 of

Nakao et al. The solid core members of Nakao et al are provided with bevels 3 to prevent damage to the generally brittle ferrite magnetic bodies that can be easily damaged in manufacturing, conveying, or assembly process. Clearly, there is nothing in the disclosure of Nakao et al to suggest forming the magnetic cores 1 as bundles of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons that are generally circular sector-shaped in plan view.

While Di Giulio et al disclose a magnetic core made of magnetic wires (17), there is no disclosure in this reference that would suggest bundles of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons which are generally circular sector-shaped in plan view.

The cores of Bolotinsky et al are not bundles of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons generally circular sector-shaped in plan view.

There is nothing in the prior art that would make obvious any combination of the teachings of the references that would produce the magnetic components recited in Claims 7 and 10.

Furthermore, with particular reference to Claim 10, the combination of references relied upon in the rejection under section 103(a) would not render obvious a magnetic component comprising a member constructed of a bundle of magnetic

wires or magnetic ribbons arranged as a generally toric-section having a circular sector-shape in plan view defined by an inner peripheral portion and an outer peripheral portion and opposite sides that diverge from respective spaced ends of the inner peripheral portion to respective spaced ends of the outer peripheral portion.

In Nakao et al, the solid cores have no spaced ends of an inner peripheral portion. To the contrary, in plan view, the sides of the magnetic cores diverge from a point, not spaced ends of an inner peripheral portion.

From the foregoing discussion of the significant differences between the inventions recited in independent Claims 7 and 10 and the prior art, it is apparent that the independent claims distinguish patentably from the prior art and should be allowed, along with the claims dependent thereon.

Further patentable features are recited in dependent Claims 19 and 22-25. Claims 19 and 22 recite that the bundle of magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons is thicker at the inner peripheral portion than at the outer peripheral portion. New Claim 23 recites that, in plan view, opposite sides of the bundle diverge from respective spaced ends of the inner peripheral portion, and that the bundle has an area defined by the inner and outer peripheral portions and

the opposite sides that is substantially covered with a multiplicity of the magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons extending between the inner peripheral portion and the outer peripheral portion.

New Claim 24 recites that, in plan view, the discrete magnetic components earlier recited in base Claim 7 are arranged as a series that substantially covers the electric winding component.

New Claim 25 recites that, in plan view, the defined area is substantially covered by the magnetic wires or magnetic ribbons extending between the inner and outer peripheral portions.

With regard to New Claims 23-25, see, for example, and without limitation, the showing in Fig. 1 of Applicant's drawings. Contrast the arrangement of Claim 24 with the showing in Fig. 1A of Nakao et al, with its intentionally-provided wide triangular gaps between the solid magnetic cores 1A, 1B and 1C.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 7-12 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and that all of the claims now asserted should be allowed.

The specification has been amended to provide specific antecedent language for the recitations of the new claims. No new matter has been introduced.

The Office is authorized to cancel non-elected Claims 1-6 and 13-16 in order to place this application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (A-9822) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 27, 2009

By: Nelson H. Shapiro
Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 903-9000

NHS:ecr